



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/681,418	10/07/2003	H. Michael Shepard	NB 2008.01 (060925-0801)	7416
38706 7590 05/14/2008 FOLEY & LARDNER LLP 975 PAGE MILL ROAD PALO ALTO, CA 94304				
EXAMINER				
CRANE, LAWRENCE E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1623				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/14/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p style="text-align: center; font-weight: bold; font-size: 1.2em;">Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</p>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 2px;">Application No. 10/681,418</td> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 2px;">Applicant(s) SHEPARD ET AL.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Examiner Lawrence E. Crane</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Art Unit 1623</td> </tr> </table>	Application No. 10/681,418	Applicant(s) SHEPARD ET AL.	Examiner Lawrence E. Crane	Art Unit 1623
Application No. 10/681,418	Applicant(s) SHEPARD ET AL.				
Examiner Lawrence E. Crane	Art Unit 1623				

All Participants:

(1) Lawrence E. Crane.

(2) Antionette Konski.

Date of Interview: 9 May 2008

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Status of Application: Amendment after final has been received

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

112, first paragraph

Claims discussed:

63 in particular

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Applicant was advised that the ODP rejection has been overcome, but that the amendment to claim 63 did not effectively limit that claim or dependent claims to the D-form of the uridylylate analogues enabled herein.

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Lawrence E. Crane/

Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1623

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)